

REMARKS

Applicants will address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1, 4, and 7 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Claims 1, 4 and 7 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering this rejection moot.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-12 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Lei (US 2004/0134420). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Claims 1-12 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering this rejection moot.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1-12

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-12 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over

Liegl (US 2004/0121264) in view of Yu (US 2005/0032378). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Claims 1-12 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering this rejection moot.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn

Claims 13-15

The Examiner also rejects Claims 13-15 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lei in view of Park (US 2003/0202132). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application and clarify the claimed invention, Applicants have amended independent Claim 13 to recite the features of: forming a plurality of first/third/fifth resist patterns...under reduced pressure; exposing the plurality of first/third/fifth resist patterns...using a photomask; and developing the irradiated plurality of first/third/fifth resist patterns to form a plurality of second/fourth/sixth resist patterns. These features are supported by, for example, at least page 11, lines 6-29, and page 13, lines 16-29 of the specification, and Figs. 12B to 12D of the present application.

In contrast, neither Lei nor Park appear to disclose or suggest these claimed features. Although Lei teaches that a photoresist layer 64a, which entirely covers a conductive layer 51, is deposited under partial vacuum chamber on the conductive layer 51 (see para. [0030] and Fig. 5 in Lei), there does not appear to be any disclosure or suggestion that a plurality of resist patterns are formed on an object by discharging a composition (or by ink jetting) under reduced pressure, that the plurality of resist patterns are exposed, and that the exposed plurality of resist patterns are developed,

as in the claimed invention. Further, although Park teaches a process for manufacturing a liquid crystal display device which includes the step of applying a negative-photoresist 140, which entirely covers a transparent conductive electrode 138 (see para. [0052] and Fig. 7D in Park), there does not appear to be any disclosure or suggest regarding a plurality of resist patterns.

Therefore, Lei and Park, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the invention of independent Claim 13, and Claim 13 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 16-18

The Examiner also rejects Claims 16-18 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lei in view of Park and further in view of Hagino (US 5,380,670). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application and clarify the claimed invention, Applicants have amended independent Claim 16 to recite the features of: forming a plurality of first/third/fifth resist patterns...under reduced pressure; exposing the plurality of first/third/fifth resist patterns...using a photomask; and developing the irradiated plurality of first/third/fifth resist patterns to form a plurality of second/fourth/sixth resist patterns. These features are supported by, for example, at least page 15, lines 2-11, and page 16, lines 21-22, 30 of the specification of the present application.

In contrast, as explained above, neither Lei nor Park disclose or suggest these claimed features. With regard to Hagino, although Hagino discloses a method for fabricating a semiconductor device, the reference does not appear to disclose or suggest the plurality of resist patterns as in the claimed invention.

Therefore, Lei, Park, and Hagino, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the invention of independent Claim 16, and Claim 16 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicants are adding new Claims 19-34. These claims are supported by, for example, at least page 2, line 20 to page 3, line 29, and page 5, line 1 to page 10, line 24 of the specification, and Figs. 1A to 1C of the present application.

With regard to new independent Claims 19, 23, 27 and 31, these claims have the following features: “forming a plurality of first resist patterns on an object by discharging a composition [or “by ink jetting” in Claims 23 and 31] under reduced pressure [or “at pressure in the range of 1×10^2 Pa to 2×10^4 Pa” in Claims 27 and 31];” “exposing the plurality of first resist patterns with light using a photomask;” and “developing the exposed plurality of first resist patterns to form a plurality of second resist patterns.”

Neither Lei, Leigl, Yu, Park, nor Hagino appear to disclose or suggest these features. Accordingly, Lei, Leigl, Yu, Park, and Hagino, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose the inventions of independent Claims 19, 23, 27, and 31, and Claims 19, 23, 27 and 31 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that these new claims be entered and allowed

If any fee is due for these new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are also submitting an information disclosure statement (IDS) herewith. It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered prior to the issuance of any further action on this application.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: March 7, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/
Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568